



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,328	08/17/2005	Teruo Komori	263370US90PCT	8645
22850	7590	02/12/2009	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			DUONG, THANH P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/12/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/516,328	Applicant(s) KOMORI ET AL.	
	Examiner TOM P. DUONG	Art Unit 1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' remarks and amendments filed on November 24, 2008 have been carefully considered. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 have been amended. New claims 9-20 have been added. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Specification

The amendment filed 11/24/08 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

The new or additional drawings of Figs. 1 and 2 submitted on 11/24/08 show the relationship between pore and pressure loss. There is no disclosure of such relationship as originally filed.

Applicant is required to remove and/or cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pitcher, Jr. (4,417,908) in view of EP 1184066 (hereinafter EP '066).

Regarding claims 1, 2, 3 and 13, Pitcher, Jr. discloses a columnar honeycomb structural body (Fig. 17) comprising: a porous ceramic block (Col. 8, lines 39-60) having a large number plurality of through holes (228) extending in parallel with one another in a length direction of the porous ceramic block, the porous ceramic block having a wall portion interposed between the through holes, wherein the through holes have one of ends sealed (Col. 9, lines 5-68) such that an opening area of one end face of the through holes is larger than an opening area of the other end face of the through holes (228, 229), the wall portion has a plurality of micro pores having an average pore diameter in a range from 5 to 30 μm (Col. 4, lines 29-37)

Pitcher, Jr. discloses the pore size can be varied based on user's operating requirements such as filter strength, durability and efficiency; contaminant size and concentration; fluid flow rate, density, viscosity, and etc. (Col. 3, lines 55-64) but does not expressly disclose the micro pores include large micro pores having a pore diameter two or more times larger than the average pore diameter, and the large micro pores have a capacity of which a rate is set to 30% or less of a capacity of the micro pores in entirety.

However, EP '066 teaches that it is conventional to provide micro pores having a pore diameter two or more times larger (pores diameter of 10 μm or more is 20% less than) than the average pore diameter (3-7 μm). Such configuration provides a

Art Unit: 1797

honeycomb filters with superior in trapping efficiency for fine solid particulates with minimum pressure loss.

Thus, it would have been obvious in view of EP '066 to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Pitcher, Jr. with the micro pore ratio as taught by EP '066 in order to gain the above benefits, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art (*In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d. 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980) and (*In re Allen* 105 USPQ 233).

Regarding claims 4 and 9, Pitcher, Jr. discloses the wall portion has a porosity in a range from 30 to 70% (Col. 3, lines 55-58).

Regarding claims 5, 10 and 14, Pitcher, Jr. discloses the plurality through holes on a cross-section perpendicular to the length direction has a density in a range from 15.5 to 62.0 pcs/cm² (Col. 11, lines 26-32).

Regarding claims 6, 11, 15, and 18, Pitcher, Jr. discloses is silent with respect to the use of a silicon carbide.

EP '066 teaches the use of a silicon carbide as the material construction for a honeycomb structure. Such material provides a honeycomb structure with superior in heat resistance (section 0015). Thus, it would have been obvious in view of EP '066 to one having ordinary skill in the art to select an appropriate material, such as silicone carbide in the device of Pitcher, Jr. , since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the

Art Unit: 1797

intended use as a matter of obvious design choice, absence showing any unexpected results. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claims 7, 12, 16, and 19, Pitcher, Jr. discloses the wall portion has a thickness in a range from 0.1 to 0.5 mm (Col. 11, lines 32-37).

Regarding claims 8, 17, and 20, Pitcher, Jr. discloses the honeycomb structure is used to purify the exhaust gas from a vehicle (Col. 10, lines 16-20).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 24, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued that “neither EP '066 nor Pitcher, Jr. teaches or suggest “a porous ceramic block having ... through holes [and] a wall portion interposed between the through holes, wherein the through holes have one of ends sealed such that an opening area of one end face of the through holes is larger than an opening area of the other end face of the through holes, the wall portion has a plurality of micro pores *having an average pore diameter in a range from 5 to 30 μ m, the micro pores include large micro pores having a pore diameter two or more times larger than the average pore diameter, and the large micro pores have a capacity of which a rate is set to 30% or less of a capacity of the micro pores in entirety*” as recited in amended Claim 1 (emphasis added in italic)”. Therefore, the structure recited in Claim 1 is clearly distinguishable from EP '066 and Pitcher, Jr., and even their combined teachings are not believed to render the structure recited in Claim 1 obvious.

Art Unit: 1797

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Pitcher, Jr. discloses the mean pore diameter can be varied from 1 to 6 microns and the physical parameters can be vary to satisfy the user's operating requirements such as filter strength, durability and efficiency; contaminant size and concentration; fluid flow rate, density, viscosity, and etc. (Col. 3, lines 55-64) but does not expressly disclose the micro pores include large micro pores having a pore diameter two or more times larger than the average pore diameter, and the large micro pores have a capacity of which a rate is set to 30% or less of a capacity of the micro pores in entirety.

However, EP '066 teaches that it is conventional to provide micro pores having a pore diameter two or more times larger (pores diameter of 10 μm or more is 20% less than) than the average pore diameter (3-7 μm). Such configuration provides a honeycomb filters with superior in trapping efficiency for fine solid particulates with minimum pressure loss.

Thus, it would have been obvious in view of EP '066 to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Pitcher, Jr. with the micro pore ratio as taught by EP '066 in order to gain the above benefits, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art (*In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d. 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980) and (*In re Allen* 105 USPQ 233).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TOM P. DUONG whose telephone number is (571)272-2794. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 4:30PM (IFP).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1797

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tom P Duong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797